UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,017	08/01/2006	Teiko Sutoh	30162/41537	4672
	7590 10/26/201 GERSTEIN & BORUN	EXAMINER		
	ACKER DRIVE	MCKANE, ELIZABETH L		
CHICAGO, IL	=		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1773	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/26/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket@marshallip.com

		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/551,0°	17	SUTOH ET AL.			
Office Action Summary				Art Unit			
		ELIZABE ⁻	TH L. MCKANE	1773			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	n appears on the	e cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ddress		
A SHO WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failur Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicating period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory reto reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by eply received by the Office later than three months after the part of t	NG DATE OF THE CFR 1.136(a). In no evon. period will apply and w statute, cause the app	HIS COMMUNICATION ent, however, may a reply be tin ill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from lication to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·		
Status							
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL . 2b) Since this application is in condition for al closed in accordance with the practice un	This action is r lowance except	on-final. for formal matters, pro		e merits is		
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5) 6) 7) 8)	Claim(s) 1-3,7 and 10-12 is/are pending i 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wit Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-3,7 and 10-12 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	thdrawn from co	nsideration.				
Applicati	on Papers						
10)	The specification is objected to by the Exa The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) _ Applicant may not request that any objection t Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the c The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) to the drawing(s) borrection is require	ne held in abeyance. See ed if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 C			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary				
3) 🔲 Inforr	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	⊦8)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/551,017 Page 2

Art Unit: 1773

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3, 7, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patel (WO 00/61200) in view of Kirckof (US 6,488,890).

Patel teaches a plasma sterilization indicator including an adsorption indicator (page 9, lines 5-9) and an organic metal compound (page 12, lines 10-26). Furthermore, Patel discloses that a product is formed in a reaction between the adsorption indicator and the activator (metal compound), which product discolors into a definitely different color change. See page 12, lines 10-13 wherein Patel teaches that the activator produces a reactive species in the presence of the plasma or hydrogen peroxide which reacts with the indicator to form a colored compound. Patel further discloses that the plasma atmosphere causes a change in pH (see Table 1). In use, an article is placed within a container to which is affixed the indicator. See page 3, lines 21-23 and lines 29-34; page 4, lines 33-34. Patel is silent with respect to the incorporation of a polyvalent alcohol in the indicator but does teach that the inks can be 'solvent based' (page 16, lines 19-20) and/or formulated in the form of ink formulations (col.15, line 10). Kirckof teaches a plasma sterilization indicator composition that can be applied to substrates using known printing processes such as ink jet printing. The composition includes a dye(s), water, and glycol solvents. See Tables 7a and 7b. The

glycol solvents used are ethylene glycol and diethylene glycol. See Example 7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a water-soluble polyol as the 'alcohol' of Patel, since Kirckof evidences its use in plasma sterilization indicator ink compositions. The results of using a known polyol solvent in the ink formulation of Patel would have been readily apparent and expected.

Patel further discloses that the adsorption indicator may be hematoxylin (page 10, line 23), eriochrome black T (page 10, line 17), or pyridlazo naphthol (page 11, line 14) and that the organic metal compound may be an aluminum chelate compound (aluminum acetylacetonate). See page 12, line 31. It is well-within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to choose from the indicators and activators disclosed by Patel to achieve the desired outcome, depending upon the chosen sterilant for the plasma, as well as the humidity, temperature, and time for sterilization. Furthermore, as the adsorption indicator of Patel is the same as that claimed in instant claim 2, it is an indicator that is capable of the "detection of metal ions that discolor as adsorbed on colloidal particles."

3. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patel in view of Kirckof as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Schmidt et al. (US 2002/01552240).

The combination of Patel with Kirckof discloses using the glycol solvent in an amount of 20% for a chemical indicator ink to be used in an ink jet printer. See Tables 7a and 7b. Schmidt et al. teaches inks for use in an ink jet printer wherein polyvalent alcohol solvents such as dipropylene glycol, polyethylene glycol, and polypropylene

Application/Control Number: 10/551,017 Page 4

Art Unit: 1773

glycol are disclosed to be present in an amount of about 2-20%. See para [0013][0014]. Schmidt et al. further discloses that dipropylene glycol is preferred as it serves
as a humectant and prevents clogging and plugging of ink jet nozzles. See para [0019].
Thus, it is deemed obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adjust the amount of
organic solvent as necessary to achieve the desired properties of the ink, where such is
readily determinable by routine experimentation.

Response to Arguments

- 4. Applicant's arguments filed 10 September 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 5. On page 4 of the Response, Applicant submits that the reaction mechanism of the instant invention is different from that of Patel. The Examiner does not contend this point. However, Applicant is reminded that the instant claims are article claims, not method claims. As the indicator of Patel employs the same organic metal compound and adsorption indicator, it meets the claim limitations.
- 6. Furthermore, although Applicant argues that Patel does not disclose "one or more compounds (A) selected from the group consisting of adsorption indicators...wherein the adsorption indicator is selected from indicators used in the detection of metal ions that discolor as adsorbed on colloidal particles," the Examiner submits that Patel does indeed teach these adsorption indicators. In fact, Patel teaches the use of hematoxylin (page 10, line 23), eriochrome black T (page 10, line 17), or pyridlazo naphthol (page 11, line 14). It is immaterial that the adsorption indicators are

Application/Control Number: 10/551,017 Page 5

Art Unit: 1773

used in a manner different from that of the instant invention as the instant claims are directed to an article *not* a method of use.

- 7. Continuing on page 5 of the Response, Applicant argues that the color change mechanisms of the present invention is entirely different from that of Patel. However, the claims require only a product formed in a reaction between at least one compound (A) and the organic metal compound (B) discolors into a definitely different color in a particular pH range due to a pH change. As set forth in the rejection *supra*, this is precisely what Patel teaches on page 12.
- 8. Moreover, although Applicant notes that in Patel the reactive species are bromine anions wherein in the present invention the reactive specie is a cation, the instant claims do not require a particular ion as the reactive species.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1773

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ELIZABETH L. MCKANE whose telephone number is (571)272-1275. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri; 5:30 a.m. - 2:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 571-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Elizabeth L McKane/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1773

elm

21 October 2010

Application/Control Number: 10/551,017

Page 7

Art Unit: 1773